

**J. BROWN VERRINTON, Printer.**

WHOLE NO. 606.

man should feel that he was so very degraded, that he was playing those whom he was to keep in subjection in the country. If the time of war with the South then the condition of the country must be fallen into such a state in which they obtained any such aid. He was adopted; if not, he was not. The cry and says were to explain why he would not. Mr. W., after all, North touching the racial rights there, he regulating the mill. He was trained to bear or appointed minister if they allowed to sit

ministration of justice in the mercantile courts. As regards them, that you say, if he have to be was the feeling in been made acquaint- the great foundations makes its own rules, I unite to protect a his own rules, as it of the negroes to striking for suffrage. Senator from New- he asserted that they there was no instance in the marine corps; and a law prohibi- ing a law, and all indispensable? He inhibition. The of- fense where it might

On Friday afternoon and evening, I went into the 'old organization' Convention, and found Mr. Foster again prominent, along with N. P. Rogers, C. C. Burleigh, H. C. Wright, Enoch Mack, &c. Here I learned that this same Foster is a regular agent of the N. H. Anti-Slavery Society. I heard him advocate the policy of employing, and paying agents, for the purpose of procuring information among the negroes, and that a salary system has begun to produce serious trouble about employing agents. One man offered to lecture for nothing. To this, it was replied by some one, that perhaps the lectures might be nothing worth. Foster put it to those who could not conscientiously pay agents, to say whether they would publicly plead the cause of the slave themselves. He seemed to put this query to one individual in particular, who promptly responded that he could do nothing of the kind, at the call of Mr. Foster—he must have a command from God. This it was that drew out Mr. Foster's disclaimer, and for the most part, the only one that was reported, any particular authority from God—and that he only acted un-

[illegible]

Next came resolutions affirming the right of free discussion, and declaring that clergymen could not be abolitionists. I then renewed clergymen's duty to the church, and that clergy and church organizations stood in the way of abolition, and must be abolished before slavery could be. These were offered by Foster, and defended by him, aided by N. P. Rogers and Henry C. Wright.

A voice in the meeting inquired—'Is not Beriah Green a clergyman, and yet an abolitionist?' Another responded—'Beriah Green is an ardent man, with strong tendencies towards liberty. Had he not been a clergyman, he probably would have been an abolitionist.' N. P. Rogers, in his Herald of Freedom, says, 'William Goodell came into the Anti-Slavery Convention in a street dress and shagel, without an anti-slavery garment on.' &c. &c.

On this subject, I spoke about an hour myself, giving my views of the ministry, of church order, and the duties of Christian abolitionists in their church relations. The audience was full, and a promiscuous one, that evening, and I was glad of the

in some instances, a social and a sectarian innovation, a dread to reach the results desired by bold, frank views. Something of this incident of the trial, although I was personally at the opening of the Convention, and saw other things, was exhibited in a picture, which a few heads were put and carried, that in names be enrolled as *Free-England*. The roll off from the business of the Convention regular enough, but certainly, to a place committed, but to put a little picture. Lew-

and solid reputation, and a strong character, standing forth as a champion with a rod at his heels, and do all on the principle of free discussion now maintained by the 'old organization' in Massachusetts and New-Hampshire.

I have now given you two specimens of New-England abolition, which you may ponder, at leisure, and mark the contrast, or trace the connexion, as you may incline. My own reflections bring me to the conclusion that they stand related to each other, as the child is related to the parent. The first is abolition in leading-strings; the second is abolition broken loose, and capering like a troop of dervishes, that had never before seen the outside of their stable. The first is abolition in the torpid state—the second is abolition in paroxysm, and flapping about, with his head cut off, and its eyes, in one place, glaring at its motions, in another. The first is abolition by authority—clerical authority—and like English dissentism (as described in the London 'Non-Conformist') asking leave, most reverently, of the ecclesiastical powers that be, (at Boston

ly stated to the Comtee persons saying, "I will soon break them away. Foster presently without any reference to the business of the Comtee. He then claimed that he had no objection to the Comtee. He said he was a member. When questioned, he communicated, but said "When asked, he said "I did not know Christ, and having existed in claiming a chair decision against







# THE LIBERATOR

BOSTON: FRIDAY MORNING, AUGUST 19, 1842.

THE UNION BETWEEN NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN SLAVERY IS ESSENTIAL TO THE PRESERVATION OF THE UNION.

THE BOOK OF RELIGIONS.

There is a volume of 400 pages, which has just been published in this city by J. H. HAYWARD, author of "The Book of Religions," &c. comprising the religious opinions of the world, particularly the Christian Religions in Europe and America. It is a most interesting and valuable work, and is in every respect worthy of the attention of all who are interested in the subject of religion. It is a most interesting and valuable work, and is in every respect worthy of the attention of all who are interested in the subject of religion.

The author of this volume is a most interesting and valuable work, and is in every respect worthy of the attention of all who are interested in the subject of religion. It is a most interesting and valuable work, and is in every respect worthy of the attention of all who are interested in the subject of religion.

The author of this volume is a most interesting and valuable work, and is in every respect worthy of the attention of all who are interested in the subject of religion. It is a most interesting and valuable work, and is in every respect worthy of the attention of all who are interested in the subject of religion.

The author of this volume is a most interesting and valuable work, and is in every respect worthy of the attention of all who are interested in the subject of religion. It is a most interesting and valuable work, and is in every respect worthy of the attention of all who are interested in the subject of religion.

The author of this volume is a most interesting and valuable work, and is in every respect worthy of the attention of all who are interested in the subject of religion. It is a most interesting and valuable work, and is in every respect worthy of the attention of all who are interested in the subject of religion.

The author of this volume is a most interesting and valuable work, and is in every respect worthy of the attention of all who are interested in the subject of religion. It is a most interesting and valuable work, and is in every respect worthy of the attention of all who are interested in the subject of religion.

The author of this volume is a most interesting and valuable work, and is in every respect worthy of the attention of all who are interested in the subject of religion. It is a most interesting and valuable work, and is in every respect worthy of the attention of all who are interested in the subject of religion.

## Sabbatical Movement.

In obedience to a call published some weeks previous, signed by a number of gentlemen of prominent wealth and influence in the city of Rochester, a Convention of delegates, friendly to a more perfect observance of the holy Sabbath, was held in the 20th of July. The officers consisted of one Judge, two Doctors of Divinity, one Reverend, six Honorable, and five Esquires!—all poor and despised followers of the Son of God! The New-York Evangelist contains a pretty full report of the proceedings, which we have read with feelings alternating from the ridiculous to the indignant, and which exhibit the latest public specimen of clerical insolence and imposture that we have seen. Not having room, in the present number, to review these proceedings, we shall barely allude to the subject at the present time. Among the letters read on the occasion was one from Governor Edward, and another from the Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen, men remarkable for their deadness to the world, their dread of popularity, and their repugnance to the honors and emoluments of public office! Another was read from that paragon of literary and spiritual pedants, the Reverend Doctor Samuel Hanson Cox, which is marked by extreme rudeness of tone and language. It will furnish a text for a longer commentary than its inflated author has ever made or dreamed of! No Papal Bull was ever more presumptuous, proscriptive, or anti-Christian. It is precisely what is wanted to wake up the people, who have been so long and so horribly priest-ridden, and to induce them to throw off the iron yoke of ecclesiastical bondage. He whose views differ from his own, in regard to the holiness of the first day of the week, this popularity-loving Presbyterian Rabbi pronounces to be 'just as really opposed to the true interests of mankind, and just as much an immoral man, as he who practices profaneness, or he who becomes intoxicated. His sin is directly against God, his worship, and the health of souls.' And he adds, in a spirit unknown even to Romanism or Judaism, 'Nor is he exempt from this *anathema*, who neglects worship on that day, [that is, neglects hearing the Rev. Dr. Cox, or some other reverend theologian.] who stays at home from church, &c. &c.!! Truly, American Protestantism is getting to be all that the Old Serpent can desire. It can cheat, lie, swear, commiserate, covet, kill, enslave, and exercise absolute despotism over the conscience—all in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost!

Now, to bring this whole matter into a narrow compass, and to meet the Sabbatical question on strictly scriptural ground, we hereby offer the following remarks—

### ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS REWARD

Will be given to any person who will prove, from the New-Testament, that Jesus Christ or his apostles ever alluded to the sin of Sabbath-breaking, as in the category of human transgressions.

### ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS REWARD

Will be given to any person who will produce the chapter and verse, either in the Old or the New Testament, in which the first day of the week is declared, by Jehovah, to be substituted for the seventh day as a Sabbath.

### ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS REWARD

Will be given to any person who will prove that Christ has commanded his disciples to observe the first day of the week, either as the Sabbath, or in commemoration of his resurrection and ascension.

### ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS REWARD

Will be given to any person who will prove, from the New-Testament, that the apostles enjoined, in the name of the Lord, the religious observance of either the first day of the week, or any other day, as the holy Sabbath.

We are perfectly aware that we hazard nothing in offering these rewards, because we know that it is not in the power of any human being to bring forward any such proof. The Sabbatical observance of the first day of the week is a trick of priestcraft, without any foundation in scripture, and hostile to the spirit and design of Christianity; consequently, the recent Sabbath Convention in Rochester is to be regarded as a religious imposture, and they who participated in it either as groping in legal blindness, or aiming to substitute the form of godliness for the power thereof. We say nothing, now, of the obligation to observe the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, except that they who are under the law are bound to hear the law. 'Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them that are under the law.'—But the freedom of the Lord is delivered from the law, and they who are delivered from the law, are delivered from the law. We say nothing, now, of the obligation to observe the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, except that they who are under the law are bound to hear the law. 'Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them that are under the law.'—But the freedom of the Lord is delivered from the law, and they who are delivered from the law, are delivered from the law.

### Disgraceful Scenes in New-Bedford and Nantucket.

The Bristol County Anti-Slavery Society held its annual meeting in New-Bedford on Monday and Tuesday last week, at which were present J. A. Collins, C. L. Remond, F. Douglass, James Boyle of Ohio, N. P. Rogers and Stephen Foster of New-Hampshire, Silas Hawley, and other speakers. The great topic under consideration was the pro-slavery position of the American church and clergy, and it excited not only a highly animated discussion in the meeting, but a most tremendous sensation out of the meeting. On Tuesday evening, the mob rallied to the support of the church and clergy abroad, and by their shoutings and hideous noises rendered it almost impossible for any of the speakers to be heard. No violence, however, was done to any person, or the building.

The meetings at Nantucket began on Wednesday afternoon, and were continued by adjournment up to the time we left for Boston on Saturday morning. The same subject was brought up for discussion, and produced even a greater sensation than at New-Bedford. The evening meetings were attended by a crowded auditory. On Thursday evening, an attempt was made to interrupt the proceedings in a riotous manner, but it did not succeed. The addresses on the occasion were well received, and produced a salutary impression. On Friday evening, however, the mob rallied in great numbers, and attempted in vain to break up the meeting by their yells, and by throwing bricks and other missiles into the windows. Several panes of glass were broken, and one lady was badly wounded by a stone that struck her with great force below the ear. The meeting adjourned at 10 o'clock. How much damage was done to the hall, (the Athenaeum,) we did not learn. We left on the Island J. A. Collins, J. Boyle, S. Foster, and F. Douglass. We have since been informed that, on Monday, a public meeting of the citizens was called, at which it was voted to grant the use of the town hall to the friends of emancipation, and to protect them in the exercise of their inalienable rights, on the evening of that day. The mob again rallied, and did much injury to the building, in spite of the efforts of the authorities to preserve the peace. We believe this is the first time the lawless spirit of mobocracy has displayed itself on that Island. To think of its being called out in defence of a corrupt church and priesthood! We shall give full particulars next week.

## THE CIVIL WAR IN RHODE-ISLAND.

PROVIDENCE, AUG. 7, 1842.

### DEAR BROTHER:

As you have now concluded the long account of the civil war, given by an 'anti-slavery resident' in Rhode-Island, I cannot consent to let it pass without saying a word; for I know much of it to be incorrect. It is lamentable to me that the anti-slavery resident, who gave that account, should show nothing by which we should judge him to be an abolitionist. He evidently shows feelings for the Dorr party, as he is always particular to say 'Gov. Dorr,' and 'the People's Constitution'—the fate of the people's cause!—they were striving for liberty, &c. To such language I object, because it is untrue. That Constitution was made only for a part of the people, as you very well know, and an 'anti-slavery resident' ought to have known it. That they were trying to obtain their rights, may be true; but that they were striving for the rights of the people, is entirely incorrect. I judge them by their works; and what do their works prove them to be? A selfish set of men—mobocrats! Why did they disfranchise part of their fellow-citizens, in their Constitution, by inserting the word 'white'—making that a qualification for the elective franchise? This is sufficient proof that they were a set of demagogues—unfeeling, destitute of humanity. What was their next movement? It was to mob the abolitionists, and break up their meetings; and this they did no less than six times, last winter, in Providence, Woonsocket, North Scituate, and Newport. And why did they do this? Because they did not dare to trust their Constitution to free discussion. At one of these riotous meetings, Thomas W. Dorr came into Franklin Hall, and stood some fifteen or twenty minutes a looking on. He saw and heard the hissing and the shuffling of feet, whenever a speaker referred to the Suffrage Constitution. Five words from him might have made all quiet—but not so. He walked silently about—plainly intimating to his party, Go on—stop the freedom of speech, lest our Constitution be disgraced in the eyes of the people. I know, says he, the word white is wrong, but a majority would have it in the Constitution; and if Parker Pillsbury, Abby Kelley, Frederick Douglass, John A. Collins, and Thomas Davis are determined to show its inconsistency, in public assemblies over the State, down their voices by hisses and yells, stamping the feet, stoning and snow-balling the windows; follow them home, and pelt them with snow-balls, until they enter their dwellings. And this they did, repeatedly, and Thomas W. Dorr never opened his mouth to stop it. I therefore put Thomas W. Dorr down as a mobocrat, as he and his party proved themselves to be, last winter. But when Thomas W. Dorr undertook to mob Gov. King out of his chair, he found matters very different. He had 'waked up the wrong passenger.' Yet some of his men were very energetic in stealing arms and ammunition, and some that had money were very liberal in purchasing. One man in my neighborhood, I learned recently in Boston, bought thirty guns with his own money. But Gov. King was so situated that he could buy more muskets than they could buy, and steal both; and now their case is a hard one. They have fallen into the hands of tyrants, and their condition is wretched indeed. As the man told his boy, 'If you didn't want to be whipped, you shouldn't have begun the fight.' But as to the treatment of the prisoners, 'anti-slavery residents' is mistaken. I know it to be false. Any one acquainted with Col. Brown would not hesitate a moment to say it was false. He was entrusted with the command at Chepachet. He would not suffer any abuse of the prisoners. They were not hurried in, but they were the whole day in travelling the sixteen miles from Chepachet to this city; and those unable to walk were furnished with a wagon, and partook of the same food that was provided for Col. Brown's regiment. In prison, I repeatedly heard from those who were permitted to call and see their friends. Every thing was done that could be, to make them comfortable; and the attending physician told me they were all, with few exceptions, well and hearty, and not ten out of 200 that even needed a portion of medicine. One sent a card of thanks to the daily paper, for the kindness rendered to him, while in confinement, by the attending officers at the prison.

I am glad that you intend to review the whole matter in the Liberator, and trust you will do it justice. I regret as a man, what has taken place; but, as a friend of human rights, I rejoice, for I believe the result will be good, in due time. The dominant party have been very much in the wrong, and they have had to pay for it, at a dear rate. They might have given the people what belonged to them, and saved all the trouble. The suffrage party also, had they been sound in principle, would undoubtedly have obtained their object. The dominant party will now avail themselves of the only chance to make a Constitution, that will be accepted by the people. There is but one voice, now, that I hear, and that is, no discrimination ought to be made on account of color. Our colored brethren will be recognized as men and citizens. I am confident no Constitution can be ratified by the people of this State, unless the word *white* is excluded; but to us who take no part in government, it is of little consequence, except so far as humanity is concerned. Let the polemic strife with the posterities of the earth. Men will fight until they learn to follow the Prince of Peace, who taught, by precept and example, to 'resist not evil.' But to have a revolution effected in the way, and by such spirits, as Thomas W. Dorr and his associates had devised, I think we all ought to pray, 'Good Lord, deliver us.'

Yours, for the truth,

A. FAIRBANKS.

### Another View of the Case.

NEW-YORK, AUG. 6, 1842.

### DEAR AND ESTEEMED FRIEND:

We regret to see, in your paper, such false views and statements in regard to Rhode-Island. Our consolation is, they are not from your pen, but, probably, from some mistaken friend.

The friends of peace cannot, of course, approve the deeds of either party; but it does appear to us, there is a difference between those who attack, and those who defend—the difference, at least, that there is in the temper and temptation.

We know the men, who went from here, seduced by the promise of plunder and good pay; and we can say nothing in their favor. They belong to that class of men, who have acted so atrociously in Cincinnati, and more recently in Philadelphia; and who are ready to act here in a similar manner. To the prejudice which generally prevails towards people of color, they add that jealousy which makes them believe the colored men are their rivals in labor, in the occupations of the city, and they would rejoice for an opportunity to drive them away.

A non-resistance friend sits beside me. He will probably had you this, and tell you of the proceedings in his State. He assures me that the stories of cruelty are all false; that the prisoners have been uniformly well-treated; the same food that was provided for the soldiers was turned over to them, and in great plenty; an evening was spread for them in the yard, under which they daily enjoyed themselves. The physician assured him that, so far from a single man dying, not one had been dangerously sick among them. They are now nearly all discharged. A few who attempted to steal the Warren guns, and some of those who did steal powder from an individual, and those who maltreated the men they stopped on the highway, are still held for trial.

He says he was early with these men, and had promises enough of their devotion to the cause of the blacks; but at the first attempt of a black man to vote, he was abused and driven away; and that at a caucus while their Convention was in session, it was declared from all quarters, that it would not do to leave out the word *white* in the qualification of voters; and it was so decided, upon some information next day in the Convention. He says the leaders assured him no force should be used, at the very time they were drill-

## THE LIBERATOR.

PROVIDENCE, AUG. 7, 1842.

### DEAR BROTHER:

As you have now concluded the long account of the civil war, given by an 'anti-slavery resident' in Rhode-Island, I cannot consent to let it pass without saying a word; for I know much of it to be incorrect. It is lamentable to me that the anti-slavery resident, who gave that account, should show nothing by which we should judge him to be an abolitionist. He evidently shows feelings for the Dorr party, as he is always particular to say 'Gov. Dorr,' and 'the People's Constitution'—the fate of the people's cause!—they were striving for liberty, &c. To such language I object, because it is untrue. That Constitution was made only for a part of the people, as you very well know, and an 'anti-slavery resident' ought to have known it. That they were trying to obtain their rights, may be true; but that they were striving for the rights of the people, is entirely incorrect. I judge them by their works; and what do their works prove them to be? A selfish set of men—mobocrats! Why did they disfranchise part of their fellow-citizens, in their Constitution, by inserting the word 'white'—making that a qualification for the elective franchise? This is sufficient proof that they were a set of demagogues—unfeeling, destitute of humanity. What was their next movement? It was to mob the abolitionists, and break up their meetings; and this they did no less than six times, last winter, in Providence, Woonsocket, North Scituate, and Newport. And why did they do this? Because they did not dare to trust their Constitution to free discussion. At one of these riotous meetings, Thomas W. Dorr came into Franklin Hall, and stood some fifteen or twenty minutes a looking on. He saw and heard the hissing and the shuffling of feet, whenever a speaker referred to the Suffrage Constitution. Five words from him might have made all quiet—but not so. He walked silently about—plainly intimating to his party, Go on—stop the freedom of speech, lest our Constitution be disgraced in the eyes of the people. I know, says he, the word white is wrong, but a majority would have it in the Constitution; and if Parker Pillsbury, Abby Kelley, Frederick Douglass, John A. Collins, and Thomas Davis are determined to show its inconsistency, in public assemblies over the State, down their voices by hisses and yells, stamping the feet, stoning and snow-balling the windows; follow them home, and pelt them with snow-balls, until they enter their dwellings. And this they did, repeatedly, and Thomas W. Dorr never opened his mouth to stop it. I therefore put Thomas W. Dorr down as a mobocrat, as he and his party proved themselves to be, last winter. But when Thomas W. Dorr undertook to mob Gov. King out of his chair, he found matters very different. He had 'waked up the wrong passenger.' Yet some of his men were very energetic in stealing arms and ammunition, and some that had money were very liberal in purchasing. One man in my neighborhood, I learned recently in Boston, bought thirty guns with his own money. But Gov. King was so situated that he could buy more muskets than they could buy, and steal both; and now their case is a hard one. They have fallen into the hands of tyrants, and their condition is wretched indeed. As the man told his boy, 'If you didn't want to be whipped, you shouldn't have begun the fight.' But as to the treatment of the prisoners, 'anti-slavery residents' is mistaken. I know it to be false. Any one acquainted with Col. Brown would not hesitate a moment to say it was false. He was entrusted with the command at Chepachet. He would not suffer any abuse of the prisoners. They were not hurried in, but they were the whole day in travelling the sixteen miles from Chepachet to this city; and those unable to walk were furnished with a wagon, and partook of the same food that was provided for Col. Brown's regiment. In prison, I repeatedly heard from those who were permitted to call and see their friends. Every thing was done that could be, to make them comfortable; and the attending physician told me they were all, with few exceptions, well and hearty, and not ten out of 200 that even needed a portion of medicine. One sent a card of thanks to the daily paper, for the kindness rendered to him, while in confinement, by the attending officers at the prison.

I am glad that you intend to review the whole matter in the Liberator, and trust you will do it justice. I regret as a man, what has taken place; but, as a friend of human rights, I rejoice, for I believe the result will be good, in due time. The dominant party have been very much in the wrong, and they have had to pay for it, at a dear rate. They might have given the people what belonged to them, and saved all the trouble. The suffrage party also, had they been sound in principle, would undoubtedly have obtained their object. The dominant party will now avail themselves of the only chance to make a Constitution, that will be accepted by the people. There is but one voice, now, that I hear, and that is, no discrimination ought to be made on account of color. Our colored brethren will be recognized as men and citizens. I am confident no Constitution can be ratified by the people of this State, unless the word *white* is excluded; but to us who take no part in government, it is of little consequence, except so far as humanity is concerned. Let the polemic strife with the posterities of the earth. Men will fight until they learn to follow the Prince of Peace, who taught, by precept and example, to 'resist not evil.' But to have a revolution effected in the way, and by such spirits, as Thomas W. Dorr and his associates had devised, I think we all ought to pray, 'Good Lord, deliver us.'

Yours, for the truth,

A. FAIRBANKS.

### Another View of the Case.

NEW-YORK, AUG. 6, 1842.

### DEAR AND ESTEEMED FRIEND:

We regret to see, in your paper, such false views and statements in regard to Rhode-Island. Our consolation is, they are not from your pen, but, probably, from some mistaken friend.

The friends of peace cannot, of course, approve the deeds of either party; but it does appear to us, there is a difference between those who attack, and those who defend—the difference, at least, that there is in the temper and temptation.

We know the men, who went from here, seduced by the promise of plunder and good pay; and we can say nothing in their favor. They belong to that class of men, who have acted so atrociously in Cincinnati, and more recently in Philadelphia; and who are ready to act here in a similar manner. To the prejudice which generally prevails towards people of color, they add that jealousy which makes them believe the colored men are their rivals in labor, in the occupations of the city, and they would rejoice for an opportunity to drive them away.

A non-resistance friend sits beside me. He will probably had you this, and tell you of the proceedings in his State. He assures me that the stories of cruelty are all false; that the prisoners have been uniformly well-treated; the same food that was provided for the soldiers was turned over to them, and in great plenty; an evening was spread for them in the yard, under which they daily enjoyed themselves. The physician assured him that, so far from a single man dying, not one had been dangerously sick among them. They are now nearly all discharged. A few who attempted to steal the Warren guns, and some of those who did steal powder from an individual, and those who maltreated the men they stopped on the highway, are still held for trial.

He says he was early with these men, and had promises enough of their devotion to the cause of the blacks; but at the first attempt of a black man to vote, he was abused and driven away; and that at a caucus while their Convention was in session, it was declared from all quarters, that it would not do to leave out the word *white* in the qualification of voters; and it was so decided, upon some information next day in the Convention. He says the leaders assured him no force should be used, at the very time they were drill-

## THE LIBERATOR.

PROVIDENCE, AUG. 7, 1842.

### DEAR BROTHER:

As you have now concluded the long account of the civil war, given by an 'anti-slavery resident' in Rhode-Island, I cannot consent to let it pass without saying a word; for I know much of it to be incorrect. It is lamentable to me that the anti-slavery resident, who gave that account, should show nothing by which we should judge him to be an abolitionist. He evidently shows feelings for the Dorr party, as he is always particular to say 'Gov. Dorr,' and 'the People's Constitution'—the fate of the people's cause!—they were striving for liberty, &c. To such language I object, because it is untrue. That Constitution was made only for a part of the people, as you very well know, and an 'anti-slavery resident' ought to have known it. That they were trying to obtain their rights, may be true; but that they were striving for the rights of the people, is entirely incorrect. I judge them by their works; and what do their works prove them to be? A selfish set of men—mobocrats! Why did they disfranchise part of their fellow-citizens, in their Constitution, by inserting the word 'white'—making that a qualification for the elective franchise? This is sufficient proof that they were a set of demagogues—unfeeling, destitute of humanity. What was their next movement? It was to mob the abolitionists, and break up their meetings; and this they did no less than six times, last winter, in Providence, Woonsocket, North Scituate, and Newport. And why did they do this? Because they did not dare to trust their Constitution to free discussion. At one of these riotous meetings, Thomas W. Dorr came into Franklin Hall, and stood some fifteen or twenty minutes a looking on. He saw and heard the hissing and the shuffling of feet, whenever a speaker referred to the Suffrage Constitution. Five words from him might have made all quiet—but not so. He walked silently about—plainly intimating to his party, Go on—stop the freedom of speech, lest our Constitution be disgraced in the eyes of the people. I know, says he, the word white is wrong, but a majority would have it in the Constitution; and if Parker Pillsbury, Abby Kelley, Frederick Douglass, John A. Collins, and Thomas Davis are determined to show its inconsistency, in public assemblies over the State, down their voices by hisses and yells, stamping the feet, stoning and snow-balling the windows; follow them home, and pelt them with snow-balls, until they enter their dwellings. And this they did, repeatedly, and Thomas W. Dorr never opened his mouth to stop it. I therefore put Thomas W. Dorr down as a mobocrat, as he and his party proved themselves to be, last winter. But when Thomas W. Dorr undertook to mob Gov. King out of his chair, he found matters very different. He had 'waked up the wrong passenger.' Yet some of his men were very energetic in stealing arms and ammunition, and some that had money were very liberal in purchasing. One man in my neighborhood, I learned recently in Boston, bought thirty guns with his own money. But Gov. King was so situated that he could buy more muskets than they could buy, and steal both; and now their case is a hard one. They have fallen into the hands of tyrants, and their condition is wretched indeed. As the man told his boy, 'If you didn't want to be whipped, you shouldn't have begun the fight.' But as to the treatment of the prisoners, 'anti-slavery residents' is mistaken. I know it to be false. Any one acquainted with Col. Brown would not hesitate a moment to say it was false. He was entrusted with the command at Chepachet. He would not suffer any abuse of the prisoners. They were not hurried in, but they were the whole day in travelling the sixteen miles from Chepachet to this city; and those unable to walk were furnished with a wagon, and partook of the same food that was provided for Col. Brown's regiment. In prison, I repeatedly heard from those who were permitted to call and see their friends. Every thing was done that could be, to make them comfortable; and the attending physician told me they were all, with few exceptions, well and hearty, and not ten out of 200 that even needed a portion of medicine. One sent a card of thanks to the daily paper, for the kindness rendered to him, while in confinement, by the attending officers at the prison.

I am glad that you intend to review the whole matter in the Liberator, and trust you will do it justice. I regret as a man, what has taken place; but, as a friend of human rights, I rejoice, for I believe the result will be good, in due time. The dominant party have been very much in the wrong, and they have had to pay for it, at a dear rate. They might have given the people what belonged to them, and saved all the trouble. The suffrage party also, had they been sound in principle, would undoubtedly have obtained their object. The dominant party will now avail themselves of the only chance to make a Constitution, that will be accepted by the people. There is but one voice, now, that I hear, and that is, no discrimination ought to be made on account of color. Our colored brethren will be recognized as men and citizens. I am confident no Constitution can be ratified by the people of this State, unless the word *white* is excluded; but to us who take no part in government, it is of little consequence, except so far as humanity is concerned. Let the polemic strife with the posterities of the earth. Men will fight until they learn to follow the Prince of Peace, who taught, by precept and example, to 'resist not evil.' But to have a revolution effected in the way, and by such spirits, as Thomas W. Dorr and his associates had devised, I think we all ought to pray, 'Good Lord, deliver us.'

Yours, for the truth,

A. FAIRBANKS.

### Another View of the Case.

NEW-YORK, AUG. 6, 1842.

### DEAR AND ESTEEMED FRIEND:

We regret to see, in your paper, such false views and statements in regard to Rhode-Island. Our consolation is, they are not from your pen, but, probably, from some mistaken friend.

The friends of peace cannot, of course, approve the deeds of either party; but it does appear to us, there is a difference between those who attack, and those who defend—the difference, at least, that there is in the temper and temptation.

We know the men, who went from here, seduced by the promise of plunder and good pay; and we can say nothing in their favor. They belong to that class of men, who have acted so atrociously in Cincinnati, and more recently in Philadelphia; and who are ready to act here in a similar manner. To the prejudice which generally prevails towards people of color, they add that jealousy which makes them believe the colored men are their rivals in labor, in the occupations of the city, and they would rejoice for an opportunity to drive them away.

A non-resistance friend sits beside me. He will probably had you this, and tell you of the proceedings in his State. He assures me that the stories of cruelty are all false; that the prisoners have been uniformly well-treated; the same food that was provided for the soldiers was turned over to them, and in great plenty; an evening was spread for them in the yard, under which they daily enjoyed themselves. The physician assured him that, so far from a single man dying, not one had been dangerously sick among them. They are now nearly all discharged. A few who attempted to steal the Warren guns, and some of those who did steal powder from an individual, and those who maltreated the men they stopped on the highway, are still held for trial.

He says he was early with these men, and had promises enough of their devotion to the cause of the blacks; but at the first attempt of a black man to vote, he was abused and driven away; and that at a caucus while their Convention was in session, it was declared from all quarters, that it would not do to leave out the word *white* in the qualification of voters; and it was so decided, upon some information next day in the Convention. He says the leaders assured him no force should be used, at the very time they were drill-

## THE LIBERATOR.

PROVIDENCE, AUG. 7, 1842.

### DEAR BROTHER:

As you have now concluded the long account of the civil war, given by an 'anti-slavery resident' in Rhode-Island, I cannot consent to let it pass without saying a word; for I know much of it to be incorrect. It is lamentable to me that the anti-slavery resident, who gave that account, should show nothing by which we should judge him to be an abolitionist. He evidently shows feelings for the Dorr party, as he is always particular to say 'Gov. Dorr,' and 'the People's Constitution'—the fate of the people's cause!—they were striving for liberty, &c. To such language I object, because it is untrue. That Constitution was made only for a part of the people, as you very well know, and an 'anti-slavery resident' ought to have known it. That they were trying to obtain their rights, may be true; but that they were striving for the rights of the people, is entirely incorrect. I judge them by their works; and what do their works prove them to be? A selfish set of men—mobocrats! Why did they disfranchise part of their fellow-citizens, in their Constitution, by inserting the word 'white'—making that a qualification for the elective franchise? This is sufficient proof that they were a set of demagogues—unfeeling, destitute of humanity. What was their next movement? It was to mob the abolitionists, and break up their meetings; and this they did no less than six times, last winter, in Providence, Woonsocket, North Scituate, and Newport. And why did they do this? Because they did not dare to trust their Constitution to free discussion. At one of these riotous meetings, Thomas W. Dorr came into Franklin Hall, and stood some fifteen or twenty minutes a looking on. He saw and heard the hissing and the shuffling of feet, whenever a speaker referred to the Suffrage Constitution. Five words from him might have made all quiet—but not so. He walked silently about—plainly intimating to his party, Go on—stop the freedom of speech, lest our Constitution be disgraced in the eyes of the people. I know, says he, the word white is wrong, but a majority would have it in the Constitution; and if Parker Pillsbury, Abby Kelley, Frederick Douglass, John A. Collins, and Thomas Davis are determined to show its inconsistency, in public assemblies over the State, down their voices by hisses and yells, stamping the feet, stoning and snow-balling the windows; follow them home, and pelt them with snow-balls, until they enter their dwellings. And this they did, repeatedly, and Thomas W. Dorr never opened his mouth to stop it. I therefore put Thomas W. Dorr down as a mobocrat, as he and his party proved themselves to be, last winter. But when Thomas W. Dorr undertook to mob Gov. King out of his chair, he found matters very different. He had 'waked up the wrong passenger.' Yet some of his men were very energetic in stealing arms and ammunition, and some that had money were very liberal in purchasing. One man in my neighborhood, I learned recently in Boston, bought thirty guns with his own money. But Gov. King was so situated that he could buy more muskets than they could buy, and steal both; and now their case is a hard one. They have fallen into the hands of tyrants, and their condition is wretched indeed. As the man told his boy, 'If you didn't want to be whipped, you shouldn't have begun the fight.' But as to the treatment of the prisoners, 'anti-slavery residents' is mistaken. I know it to be false. Any one acquainted with Col. Brown would not hesitate a moment to say it was false. He was entrusted with the command at Chepachet. He would not suffer any abuse of the prisoners. They were not hurried in, but they were the whole day in travelling the sixteen miles from Chepachet to this city; and those unable to walk were furnished with a wagon, and partook of the same food that was provided for Col. Brown's regiment. In prison, I repeatedly heard from those who were permitted to call and see their friends. Every thing was done that could be, to make them comfortable; and the attending physician told me they were all, with few exceptions, well and hearty, and not ten out of 200 that even needed a portion of medicine. One sent a card of thanks to the daily paper, for the kindness rendered to him, while in confinement, by the attending officers at the prison.

I am glad that you intend to review the whole matter in the Liberator, and trust you will do it justice. I regret as a man, what has taken place; but, as a friend of human rights, I rejoice, for I believe the result will be good, in due time. The dominant party have been very much in the wrong, and they have had to pay for it, at a dear rate. They might have given the people what belonged to them, and saved all the trouble. The suffrage party also, had they been sound in principle, would undoubtedly have obtained their object. The dominant party will now avail themselves of the only chance to make a Constitution, that will be accepted by the people. There is but one voice, now, that I hear, and that is, no discrimination ought to be made on account of color. Our colored brethren will be recognized as men and citizens. I am confident no Constitution can be ratified by the people of this State, unless the word *white* is excluded; but to us who take no part in government, it is of little consequence, except so far as humanity is concerned. Let the polemic strife with the posterities of the earth. Men will fight until they learn to follow the Prince of Peace, who taught, by precept and example, to 'resist not evil.' But to have a revolution effected in the way, and by such spirits, as Thomas W. Dorr and his associates had devised, I think we all ought to pray, 'Good Lord, deliver us.'

Yours, for the truth,

A. FAIRBANKS.

### Another View of the Case.

NEW-YORK, AUG. 6, 1842.

### DEAR AND ESTEEMED FRIEND:

We regret to see, in your paper, such false views and statements in regard to Rhode-Island. Our consolation is, they are not from your pen, but, probably, from some mistaken friend.

The friends of peace cannot, of course, approve the deeds of either party; but it does appear to us, there is a difference between those who attack, and those who defend—the difference, at least, that there is in the temper and temptation.

We know the men, who went from here, seduced by the promise of plunder and good pay; and we can say nothing in their favor. They belong to that class of men, who have acted so atrociously in Cincinnati, and more recently in Philadelphia; and who are ready to act here in a similar manner. To the prejudice which generally prevails towards people of color, they add that jealousy which makes them believe the colored men are their rivals in labor, in the occupations of the city, and they would rejoice for an opportunity to drive them away.

A non-resistance friend sits beside me. He will probably had you this, and tell you of the proceedings in his State. He assures me that the stories of cruelty are all false; that the prisoners have been uniformly well-treated; the same food that was provided for the soldiers was turned over to them, and in great plenty; an evening was spread for them in the yard, under which they daily enjoyed themselves. The physician assured him that, so far from a single man dying, not one had been dangerously sick among them. They are now nearly all discharged. A few who attempted to steal the Warren guns, and some of those who did steal powder from an individual, and those who maltreated the men they stopped on the highway, are still held for trial.

He says he was early with these men, and had promises enough of their devotion to the cause of the blacks; but at the first attempt of a black man to vote, he was abused and driven away; and that at a caucus while their Convention was in session, it was declared from all quarters, that it would not do to leave out the word *white* in the qualification of voters; and it was so decided, upon



